DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 254 UD 017 974

AUTHOR Gordon, Edmund G.
TITLE Urban Education: Its Conceptual and Functional Domains.
PUB DATE 26 Nov 75
NOTE 38p.; Not available in hard copy due to print quality of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Conceptual Schemes; *Cultural Pluralism; Educational Needs; *Educational Planning; Educational Policy; *Environmental Influences; Ethnic Groups; Ethnicity; Minority Groups; *State of the Art Reviews; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Human Individual Potentials; *Urban Problems

ABSTRACT

Because of the heavy concentration of low ethnic status minorities dwelling in cities, urban education has been equated with the problems of low status persons. However, there are problems that are peculiar to education as it is influenced by urban development that go beyond the problems of special ethnic, low status minority groups. The problems and opportunities of urban education, then, are not simply those related to education in the cities and directed toward minorities, but increasingly, the field of education must be defined as including education for an urban nation. One of the issues that has surfaced in this movement toward "urbanicity" is that of interactions endemic to urban communities. The great concentration of people, resources, etc., provides for kinds of interactions which form the core of the developmental process in man. Another issue that can be added is that of critical mass, i.e., the mass of human, technological, monetary, and value resources in cities. Identifying the level of magnitude of the mass necessary to particular processes and the ways in which that mass may be manipulated to produce effective services is another critical concern for an urban nation. Another issue is that of adaptation, the capacity to adapt and readapt and use one's self in creative ways in response to a variety of inputs. There are central features of urbanicity which have particular implications for education. They are: (1) the diversity of human characteristics, (2) the pluralism characteristic of urban society in which many values exist simultaneously, (3) mobility, or the capacity of society to put people in a variety of settings, and the requirements of those settings to which people make their adaptations, (4) social immobility, and (5) bureaucratic rigidity. In conclusion, what happens in education over the next few years may be more greatly influenced by things that happen in our own particular setting (for example, manipulating and using the political economy in the society), than the things that are done in education itself. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"Urban Education': Its Conceptual and Functional Domains" G124

ED150254

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONFERENCE ON URBAN EDUCATION

Kansas City

- X

TRANSCRIPTION of CONFERENCE ON URBAN EDUCATION, held in Kansas City, Missouri, November 24th through November 26th, 1975.

[ONE TAPE: NINETY MINUTES.]

[PROJECT 800-A]

800

UDO 17974

ADLER REPORTING SERVICE
STENOTYPE REPORTERS
15 PARK ROW
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10038
CORTLANDT 7-3343
CORTLANDT 7-3339
NIGHT PHONE 233-3151

MR. GORDON: .. a concensual synthesis of our concerns. Now, in trying to do this, I'll draw from what I've heard. But I also will feel free to draw upon some of the things I didn't hear, and probably think we ought to be talking about.

I think it's worth remembering that the problem that brought us here is in part a function of the fact that the history of the human species has been marked by a continuous movement towards congregation -- that is, towards the concentration of human beings in social collectives.

This movement can be traced from the very, very episodic, random team efforts of man at hunting -- We can see it in the early food gathering activities of man. And we can trace it through the emergence of the family, the clan and the tribal kinship relationships -- all efforts directed at mutual protection, at mutual food getting, at mutual food cultivation and territorial establishment.

We can see this move through the enslavement and control practiced by feudal lords. We can see it in the organized and cooperative enslavement and

control practiced by the lords of capitalism -- and even more recently by the lords of socialism.

You've seen movement from villages to towns and from towns to cities. And we have seen the cities move to metropolises. And, as Neil Sullivan was reminding us last night, you have even seen those metropolises become large continuous metropolitan belts.

In our conference we have referred to a number of characteristics of what I would like to call "urbanicity." We have been reminded that urban areas are characterized by large numbers of people, by high densities, by great heterogeneity of human characteristics and people concerns; by high degrees of mobility; a relatively high incidence of anonymity, conflicting lifestyles in close proximity; cultural richness; concentration of commerce and technology; ease of communication; diversity -- both challenge and stimulation -- validity and rigidity of institutional structures.

We could extend this in noting some twenty

characteristics.

In discussing these as they are positive as well as negative, we can focus most of our attention on population magnitude and density. As we look at these characteristics, however, while they were initially associated with magnitude and density, increasingly they are associated with complex technological societies.

The essence of all or most of these characteristics we think of being associated with urbanicity or urban living -- are a part of the experience of almost all people in our country, thanks to modern communication and transportation.

I think of urbanicity as a societal condition most evident in better than half of our population that lives in urban areas, but which is not unknown to it, or without influence and impact upon that minority of our population that lives outside of the metropolitan areas.

The problems and opportunities of urban education, then, are not simply those related to education in our cities, but increasingly this

field must be defined as including education in what is rapidly becoming an urban nation.

In our discussions we tended to focus on issues related to ethnic minority status, low socioeconomic status.

Now it's interesting, if we had been holding this meeting, say, in 1910, 1920 -- maybe even in 1930 -- we probably would have been most concerned with rural problems. That's because, given the heavy representation in our conference with persons concerned with minority status -- in the early part of our century, if you were talking about black people or native Americans -- or even the growing Spanish-speaking population, you would have to go to rural areas to find them.

I think our emphasis on low ethnic status in the discussions of this conference are a reflection of the fact that this is where low status people are now concentrated. It doesn't mean that they're not poor people or black people, Spanish-speaking people and native American people in the less highly populated areas, but the largest

concentrations of these people, the largest numbers of these people, now are in our cities.

I think this has led us to almost equate urban education with the problems of low status persons. But there are problems more critical and certainly more crucially related to our future than are the problems of low status people in our society.

I don't mean to demean the importance of ethnicity or the importance of poverty in the lives of people. These are tremendously important issues. And society must do something about them.

But what I am suggesting is that if we as a group of professionals too greatly confuse the problems of urban education with the problems of these special populations, we may do a disservice to the special populations, to the profession, and to the mission.

Let's identify some of the issues that have surfaced, that speak to the broader concerns.

I think it was in Prof. Eckstein's talk [phon.] that he talked about the interactions that are

peculiar to urban communities -- not that interactions don't occur in other communities -- but the great concentration of people, of resources, of sources of stimulation, of money, of conflict, provides for kinds of interactions which we are beginning to recognize are probably the core of the developmental process in man.

In an earlier period psychology tended to focus on preformationist theories of man. That is, we kind of thought that what we identify as "human" in man was largely a product of some inborn pattern that simply unfolded to maturity.

Increasingly students of human behavior and social organization look to the interactions between whatever is given in an organism and whatever is given in the environmental situation.

To identify this as the source of the product of, say, the social behavior, the personal behavior, intellectual behavior -- almost any aspect of behavior -- the definition, the identification, the specification, and eventually the manipulation of those interactions may be the most crucial

tool that man has for influencing the development of man.

To neglect it leaves the developmental process largely to chance or to neglect.

Another issue far more important than ethnic status or economic status is the issue of critical mass.

Again, if we review some of the discussions we have heard here, or if we simply look at our cities, we see that one of the great advantages as well as one of the great problems of an urban mission has to do with the establishment or maintenance of, the control of, the utilization of, the mass of resources, whether we talk of human resources or technological resources or monetary resources or value resources -- a mass that is sufficient to make a difference in the society or to make a difference in the life of a person.

Again, identifying of the level of the magnitude of the mass necessary to particular processes and the ways in which that mass may be and needs to be manipulated either to produce

effective education or effective health service or effective religious organization or effective political organization, is a critical concern for a nation that has become an urban nation.

There is the problem of contradiction. In almost everything we face the problem of contradiction.

And that is, for every phenomenon there is its positive side and its negative side. And these opposites do not maintain their positions. They are dynamic. At one point one aspect of the contradiction may be in the acendancy. At another point the other aspect of the contradiction is in the acendancy.

And the task of those of us who would deal creatively with contradiction is to understand those relative positions, the ways in which those relative positions can be utilized for particular goals, and the ways in which those relative positions cannot be changed but must be adapted to.

There is the issue of adaptation.

Certainly as people become more closely knit together, more interdependent, influence each other more, their lives are more and more dependent upon successful relations with each other: the capacity to adapt and readapt.

I think Toffler talks about the concept in the concept of -- in the context of adapting to change. And maybe adaptation in relation to change, if we follow Toffler, may be the most important skill that we develop in man, as we become more and more urbanized and more and more interdependent.

As the people of a society come to be more and more influenced by predominant trends of that society -- and I am beginning to think urbanicity in that context -- as a kid growing up in rural Mississippi with TV, radio, transportation, various forms of communication -- I am not sure that that youngster is as uninfluenced by what happens in Kansas City, Chicago and New York as we once thought.

And what I am suggesting here is that the adaptation to those varieties of inputs which are

a function now of the fact that even though we have urban and rural areas, everybody is influenced by the urban domination of society -- And the capacity then to adapt, to utilize one's self in purposefully creative ways in response to the varieties of inputs, the varieties of stimuli, becomes of critical importance.

As the magnitude of the population increases, as it increases in density and as it increases in its impact on those individuals in society, we have as one of the very difficult problems to tackle the problem that relates to identity, individualization and group survival.

We are a nation that has given high priority through most of our history to the concept of individuality, to the independence of the individual, to autonomous behavior. Yet as our society becomes more and more urbanized, more congested, more dense -- some say "condensed" and in essence it may be "condensed" -- maintaining "my" identity, protecting "my" right to individuality at the same time that we do something about the problem

of group survival, becomes increasingly difficult.

If we take New York City which is referred to now largely because of its economic problems, it's very clear there that while the welfare recipients -- while the survival of welfare recipients may be greatly affected by the economic problems in New York City, there is another group at the opposite extreme of the economic ladder -- the bankers -- who are equally affected.

Because if one looks at the three heaviest drains on the budget of New York City, they are welfare, they are debt service -- which we tend to forget when we talk about problems of that city -- that is, the fact that such a large proportion of that city's money goes to pay banks for having loaned it money at rates of interest that are exorbitant.

And the third biggest amount of money is to support the benefits package of the upper lower class, lower middle class or civil service population of that city -- one of the best retirement programs in the country.

And I'll talk a bit about that, because I spent a good bit of my earlier life in support of the efforts of unions in getting a fairer share of the dollar and establishing the kinds of benefits packages that New York City has really been proud of.

But I think -- and I'm not sure of these figures -- in New York City after about 20 years of service, one can retire on salaries which even in my mid-career I would have been delighted to get.

People move out of that system to retire at fifteen, twenty, thirty forty thousand dollars.

In a report made about a year ago it was suggested that if that retirement plan continued at its present level, by 1980, I think, it's cost to the City would be something like three and a half billion dollars.

So what I am suggesting is, that the various segments of that population, of individuals who form these various segments, have problems that relate to them as individuals, but those same problems are very closely related to the privileged

status of the institutions of that city.

So that the individual identity, group survival, maintenance of individual characteristics, becomes a crucial issue.

There is a second problem area that has to do with something that I like to call continuity and change.

In large, dense populations the anonymity that people have, the absence of control over individual behavior which is peculiar to the -- or was peculiar to the small rural community -- gets lost. So that the possibility for change is ever present. At the same time the weight of the organization -- and if we stick to education now and essentially talk about the bureaucracy that has been established to maintain the system of education in that city -- the weight of that bureaucracy -- even though individuals can get lost in that system and because they are lost they have the freedom to be erratic, to do different things -- the weight of the bureaucracy is a countervailing force that forces

conformity.

Or, to put it in a different sense, man needs continuity in his experiences. But we also know that the essence of growth movement is a function of the tension that exists in the system between old and new. In other words, there has got to be the possibility of change in order to stimulate the kind of movement that individuals need in order to grow, to develop, to create.

Closely related to that is the concern for congruence and incongruence. And here the multiplicity of values, the multiplicity of cultural forms, the multiplicity of interests -- I think in Dr. Grapner's talk [phon.], he talked about the fact that in the voting behavior of people in large metropolitan areas -- and I would say the voting behavior of people in this country -- is closely tied to their position in society.

And just so as there are diverse positions, there is conflict of interest, lack of congruency between the interests of one group and another

group. Yet for a society to move ahead smoothly as well as for development to move smoothly in individuals, that sense of congruence, that sense of fitting together, of orchestration, must be had.

But when we talk about such a vast population, when we talk about such a diverse population, we know that one of the facts of urbanicity is incongruence. Incongruence between the various elements.

What then are the central features of urbanicity which have particular implications for education?

Gene [phon.] and I have agreed to cut my clock short, so let me name just three of them -- and they are three that I have been concerned with for the last two or three years.

The first one I call diversity of human characteristics.

I came to this concern largely out of concern with low status persons -- that is, low ethnic status or low economic status. And in my earlier

work I used to give great attention to the characteristics of these populations and the ways in which they differ from the so-called majority population.

As that work has progressed I have come to realize that that was an error; that the article I wrote for the Bureau of Educational Research back in 1965 that seems to get a lot of attention, in which I talked about the characteristics of disadvantaged people, was really inappropriate; not simply in the sense that I was stigmatizing those people -- an issue that got commented on last night -- by calling them "disadvantaged," but, even more important, by asserting that they represented a relatively homogeneous group.

They do not.

They have poverty and low status and certain kinds of maltreatment as common characteristics. But if one looks at the functional characteristics of that population, what you see is that those functional characteristics vary as much within these groups as they do between the lower status and higher status groups.

So that an increasingly urgent problem of an urban nature is the fact of diversity of human characteristics. And that diversity has to be spelled out in a variety of ways.

I am suggesting these days that those characteristics by which we have previously judged -- that is, ethnic status, economic status, sex status, cultural status, religious status -- as important as they may be for political purposes, are relatively unimportant for pedagogical purposes.

In other words, if my task is to organize the learning experiences of Johnny Jones, I am less convinced in 1975 than I was in 1965 that knowing the ethnicity or ethnic background of Johnny Jones is important.

What is far more important is knowing how that youngster goes about solving intellectual and social problems.

We talk of that in psychology as cognitive gestalt.

We know that some people approach tasks in the abstract and other people are totally at a

loss when they are confronted with an abstract problem, and unless they can get its concrete representation -- things they can feel or taste or hear or see, they simply can't deal with it.

We know that some people approach tasks [indistinct word]. That is, they can quickly size up an entire situation anddeal with it. Other people have to deal with different aspects.

There is a relatively highly developed body of knowledge that relates to which -- to the ways in which people differ in functional aspects of both intellectual and social behavior. That knowledge has not crept into the front of education.

But if our concern is with populations that we know to differ on broad social characteristic grounds, I am simply suggesting that that may not be sufficient information to adequately provide for educational planning, and maybe we need to give more attention to differences in the functional characteristics that inform instruction.

Another area of difference is something we

call temperament. My late colleague Herbert Burch and [indistinct name] and Alexander Thomas, have spent the last twenty years working on problems of the temperamental differences in children. Their research suggests that there are characteristics of temperament that you can identify in youngsters at about three months of age.

And as those youngsters progress through the years -- they have followed their population down through the nineteenth year -- my oldest daughter was part of that first batch of kids -- those temperamental characteristics identified in those very early years are still dominant in the behavior of these youngsters as young adults.

Before Burch died, he and I were working with newborn infants. And we found what we think are precursors of temperament expressed in the very first hours of youngsters' lives.

And if we are right it may be that my deliberate, analytic temperament, slow-to-arrive-at-a-decision, as opposed to Robert Smith's

tendency to be impulsive, quick-to-arrive-at-a-decision -- synergistic rather than analytic -- these may be characteristics that are a function of the way in which the nervous system is organized.

Now in one of the books that Stella wrote on this work she calls it "Temperament & Behavior Disorders" -- she suggests that maybe as much as fifty percent of the learning problems and behavior disorders of kids are a function of a failure to achieve a match between temperamental traits of a youngster and the temperamental demands of learning situations.

In other words, if you have got a youngster who is a quick, impulsive child, who moves with dispatch with whatever he does and a parent or a teacher who is deliberate, analytic, slow and is constantly holding back that kid, that youngster is being educated, socialized, to his disadvantage, because they're not building on his strength, but forcing a pattern which is atypical for him.

And the opposite: The youngster who is

slow of response, deliberate, analytic, cautious in his approach, who has a teacher or a parent, now, who demands immediate response, who speaks rapidly, quickly and, "If you don't get it, you missed it," that youngster may have just as good a capacity to comprehend, but is nonetheless handicapped, disadvantaged, maltreated, because the learning environment is at variance with his temperamental traits.

Now there is a broad body of research relating to temperament, to interest, to cognitive style, which is creeping into education, but this is not being adequately taken advantage of.

What I am suggesting here is that as important as it is to give greater attention to the social-cultural characteristics of young people in the pattern of their educational experiences, maybe we have got to give even more attention to these functional characteristics which inform the environmental structure.

So that diversity of human characteristics is a terribly important concern.

Running parallel to that is a concern for pluralism.

While our population differs widely in its characteristics, it also differs in its values. And while we had at one period of our society a kind of amalgamation with respect to standards and with respect to values, we are increasingly becoming a pluralistic society in which many values, many standards, exist parallel.

And a society that is going to develop people -- a pluralistic society that is going to give attention to the development of people, not only has to take into account the diversities in the characteristics that people bring to the developmental situation, but it also has to do this against the background of the variety of standards criteria by which one's outcome behavior suggest -- not only is that variation in outcomes a fact of life, but we in addition have the problem that one needs in urban society to be able to function against the criteria of multiple settings.

So we cannot prepare a youngster now, who grew up in rural Mississippi, because we know that in his lifetime he may live in San Francisco, in New York or Portland, Oregon -- we cannot socialize a person to the cultural standards of, shall we say, the Southern Baptist Church, when we know that in the course of that person's life he or she is going to have to exist in a variety of other cultural settings that make different kinds of demands for adaptation.

The pluralism in a society presents tremendously important problems of education which we have not yet tackled. Let me move quickly on to two more:

The second broad category has to do with what I call mobility. Actually we should talk of it as mobility and immobility.

And here I'm thinking of a problem of geographic mobility first, and a problem of social immobility.

Clearly as our urban nation advances, the fact of physical movement becomes increasingly possible

to people. Not only is there physical mobility but there is psychological mobility. We can sit here in Kansas City and observe now by television something that is happening in London or in Seattle.

And it may be -- given the capacity of human beings to deal with vicarious experiences -- it may be that those vicarious and artificially created mobilities have the same importance in the development of persons that the physical mobility which is possible.

So that when we talk about physical mobility or geographical mobility or cultural mobility, what we are really talking about is the capacity of the society to put people in a variety of settings, and the requirements of those settings that people make their adaptations to.

Parallel to that is the fact of social immobility.

In the early development of this country there were vast open spaces, relatively undeveloped industries, opportunities for relatively

unsophisticated people to quickly rise to political position, movement up and down the social ladder was a fact of life then.

Ralph Tyler [phon.] tells a little story about social mobility which I probably shouldn't take the time to talk about.

He was really talking about the Horatio Alger myth -- that is, the capacity of persons to move from very low status to very high achievement in our society. That is still possible. But it is so rare as to be a misleading assertion of opportunity for youngsters in this country. The number of people who can move from very low beginnings on to very high status in our society is very, very limited.

I don't think we have ever been as great as we said it was. But it's certainly true that it was easier to "get your thing together" and make a fortune or achieve high status in some area in the 1800's in this country than it is in the 1900's.

The fact that we are more and more subjected

to caste status -- that is, the relatively fixed social position -- becomes an important issue as we begin to think about the impact now of urban development on the development of individuals in an urban nation.

[Indistinct phrase] to some extent, talks about the way in which the perception of opportunity for public mobility may be related to education. And it's a very simply formulation. It simply says that if I perceive that my chances of movement in the society, and for the utilization of the things that I invest my efforts in in education -- if I perceive my chances are rather slight or not as good as those of another group in society, then to the extent -- then the effort made to get equally involved in that educational opportunity is foolish.

This, translated -- what I am obviously saying -- is, that if we recognize that the unemployment rate for black youth in this country is something like 37 to 40 percent and talk to those youngsters now about the opportunities that this

country provides if you do your homework -- that is dishonest. And if one is really going to talk about improving education for those youngsters, he argues -- we educational psychologists he tells -- that maybe we ought not be tinkering now with the technical problems of education; maybe what we really ought to do is tinker with the opporunity structure that youngsters perceive out there; social immobility.

The third part -- and I probably ought to wrap up -- is something that I call rigidity. Perhaps it is "validity and rigidity."

If we consider that as societies become more compressed, as they become more urbanized we almost automatically develop structures by which we regulate the society -- again, talking about bureaucracy.

One of the functions of bureaucracy, one of the functions of institutions of social control is rigidity. You have got to have enough stability there to manage the thing. And stability in the hands of human beings most often gets

reflected as rigidity. Just think of the ease -- I should say lack of ease -- with which any of us change anything. Once you have made the decision, once you start doing it this way, getting people to do it a different way, getting them to change the behavior, change the organization, change the opportunity structure, is terribly, terribly difficult.

Now, there are some advantages in that.

I think if there were not system, if there were not structure, if there were not bureaucracies in large urban contexts, we would fall apart.

But one of the prices that we pay for that is a rigidity of structure that makes it difficult for these same institutions to be flexibile enough to serve the varied interests of the population.

Again, to tie it back to education and the education program I know best, in New York City there is no lack of understanding in our system for the needs of the diverse students in that system. But the translation of that understanding into direct services for youngsters, mediated by a

bureaucracy that is intent upon protecting itself and protecting that system, creates a rigidity in the behavior of that institution, that makes it impossible to serve kids.

Now, unless we find some way of dealing with that kind of institutional rigidity, we are in trouble. And I am suggesting that the more we become urbanized, the more bureaucracy, the more rigidity, the more structure we are going to have.

Yet the increasing structure, the increasing rigidity of the system is counterproductive of the things which we in education are supposedly committed to.

But lest we find it too easy to criticize the system, let's look at another aspect of rigidity; that is, the rigidity of behavior of individuals.

In our highly advanced society, we have more knowledge, more technology than anyone. And I would like to call attention to one of my pet peeves and that is smoking. Nobody in 1975 in this country is unaware of the deleterious effect smoking has on the health of the person who smokes

and on the health of those of us who have to breathe his smoke.

But getting people to use that information and change the behavior to correspond with what we understand is a terribly, terribly difficult task.

Those of us who teach: We know -- and I have to say this about myself. We know that one of the poorest ways of helping people to understand anything is to stand up there and yell at them. Yet I spend half of my life moving around the country exhorting people.

I learned in my earlier incarnations that preaching at people never stops them from sinning. But we're around, you know, still preaching at people.

Another example. I was out in Pittsburgh a few years ago looking at Bob Glaser's [phon.] individual prescribed instruction program. And I have nothing but the highest regard for Bob and what he is trying to do. I think that IPI is the wave of the future in education.

But as I went from classroom to classroom to classroom, using the best material, the material that is most sensitive to the differential rates of learning that exist, I found teachers using that individually prescribed material in the same way that they had used their previous material in teaching the groups of 30 kids.

In other words, the behavior simply didn't follow their understanding of the resources that were available.

One of the facts of human behavior is its rigidity. And though we find ways to make us more fluid, we are going to less well serve the goals of education.

However, one big advantage is, of large mass, of large [indistinct word], of the anonymity that comes with this, is the freedom I mentioned earlier for me to, you know, "do my thing." It's far easier for me at a large university like Columbia to be a maverick than it was at a small university, say, like Howard University.

Down at Miles College [phon.] in the South,

I think the entire faculty numbers 80 people. You know, in that small a setting you can't do much that's different. But as you move into larger settings where you have greater anonymity, there is greater freedom to do things.

So that one of the advantages of urbanicity is that it does provide for greater individual freedom. One of the disadvantages is that the weight of it, the rigidity of it makes the expression of that freedom far more difficult.

Now, I wish we had another hour to talk about some of these things. What I am really suggesting is that while many of us came to this conference hoping we would learn more about teaching black kids or Chicano kids or native American kids, while we have tended in the past to think of urban education as being concerned with these populations because they are in large measure part of the urban areas now, what I am suggesting is that there are problems that are peculiar to education as it is influenced by urban development that go far beyond the problems of

these special groups.

One of my great mentors was F.D.B. DuBois. And early in the century DuBois [phon.] wrote that the problem of the Twentieth Century was the problem of the color line. And for a number of years I think DuBois believed that.

Just before he left this country, though, in 1960, in a discussion DuBois said that he had changed that position. He didn't think that color was unimportant but he thought that there were other differences between people that were of greater importance.

Primary among them, he said, was the problem of politics and economics. And he suggested that until we begin to appreciate the interplay between the politics of a society, the economics of a society, and the fact that differences between the members of that society exist, we are not going to make much progress.

That is what I am here to say.

I suspect that what we do in education, urban or nonurban, over the next few years, may be

more greatly influenced by things that happen in our [indistinct word] setting, controlling, anticipating and manipulating and utilizing the political economy in the society, than the things that we do in education itself.

I as an educational psychologist will continue to worry about how we assess the functioning of youngsters. I wish I had time to talk about this, about trying to create this match between the variety of characteristics of youngsters which they bring to school and the desire for learning experiences.

But at the same time I will be worrying about a force like the influx of the strategies of organized labor into the pedagogical process and the educational system.

Again, what has happened there is despite the fact that the state law places responsibility for educational policy making in the hands of lay board members. Educational policy in New York City is made by the UFT. Because nothing can happen in that system that doesn't have the

approval of the UFT.

Now, again, that's not what we [indistinct word] the union, except that as unionism becomes a new force for reaction or conservatism serving the private interests of workers rather than the collective interest of the kids, I've got to be "agin it."

That takes us into the area of politics and economics. And unless we can bring the monetary resources to bear on this problem where necessary, we are not going to solve it. We're not going to take anybody [indistinct phrase] because we spend two million, two billion dollars of federal money and something like $60 billion totally around the country for education and it's not enough.

The estimate of what would be required to provide good education in this country made six years ago, with the latest rates of inflation, we estimated that the cost would be something like $100 billion.

Until we can begin to divert that kind of

money the best of our [indistinct word] and the best of our professional services to the problems of education, doing this all in a society that has become urban with all of its problems and all of its advantages, I don't think we are going to go very far.

It's late, snowing. I know you want to leave. Thanks for listening to it; thanks for coming. [APPLAUSE.]

CHAIRMAN: Any members of the steering committee who are still here, I would just like to see the rest of you.

[Tape stop/start.]

VOICE: I think it would have to do with how parents adopt roles that they have never occupied before.

Maybe that's not even so. I mean, you talk about the management of people's lives.

I'm not sure.

VOICE: I guess you talk about how you adopt the roles that you have never taken before and that sort of needs to be treated.